

COMMISSIONERS APPROVAL

ROKOSCH 

GRANDSTAFF 

THOMPSON 

CHILCOTT 

DRISCOLL 

PLETTENBERG (Clerk & Recorder)

Date.....October 30, 2007

Members Present.....Commissioner Jim Rokosch,  
Commissioner Carlotta Grandstaff, Commissioner Alan Thompson and Commissioner  
Kathleen Driscoll

Minutes: Beth Perkins

Commissioner Chilcott attended a conference for the Association of Government; Risk  
Management Leadership.

► The Board met for a discussion of potential Eight Mile Creek Voluntary Zoning  
District. Present were Civil Counsel Alex Beal, Planning Director Karen Hughes, Planner  
Shaun Morrell, Planner Renee Lemon, Attorney Bill Van Canagan and several citizens.

Commissioner Rokosch called the meeting to order and requested Alex give an overview.

Alex stated there has been a lot of talk regarding the development in the Eight Mile Creek  
area. Today's meeting is to discuss such development, particularly the roads since there  
are several subdivisions proposed in the area.

Commissioner Thompson asked if there had been any input from the people living there.  
Alex replied a little input has been received, but most of the discussion has come from  
the county in an attempt to look forward. Commissioner Thompson discussed the Upper  
Woodchuck Road. Alex stated the idea is to have a general contract by the developers to  
address the road pro rata issues. Commissioner Driscoll reiterated the need to be forward  
thinking. Commissioner Rokosch stated the Planning Committees would be a proper  
venue for this type of discussion. Alex replied time is an important issue because many of  
these subdivision proposals are in the pipeline and will be coming before the countywide  
zoning will be in place. Commissioner Driscoll questioned the acreage proposed for the  
subdivisions. Karen replied she does not know the amount off the top of her head.

Commissioner Grandstaff stated she believes the upcoming proposals equal approximately 5,500 acres.

Karen presented a map to the Board of the proposed subdivisions which included major and minor subdivisions. She stated most shown on the map have been acted upon. Commissioner Driscoll stated all the traffic is on Eight Mile Creek Road. Karen confirmed that and added traffic is also on Hidden Valley Road.

Dave Ohnstad stated the Road & Bridge Department has an interest in the road infrastructure. Eight Mile Creek Road is the only access in and out. Dave discussed the possibility of a private entity handling the road improvements. The pressure to develop in that area continues to be strong. Dave spoke about wildlife corridors, view sheds, road development and maintenance. Dave then suggested the developers work with the Road & Bridge Department and the Planning Department for infrastructure development for those to facilitate construction within infrastructures. Commissioner Rokosch stated that is exactly what they are trying to address today. He does not understand why a 12 month time period is not long enough to get the job done.

Ed Churchill stated he is doing some land development in Ravalli County. His problem is they have already been working on this development for two years. He lives in Gallatin County where it has taken over ten years for countywide zoning to be implemented and now he has just given up. He would be amazed if Ravalli County established countywide zoning in a year. 'It is a killer to the developer' who buys property under the current regulations and laws and then two years down the road, have those regulations and laws change. He advised the Commissioners that everything they do in this room ends up being a cost to the citizens of Ravalli County.

Commissioner Rokosch stated what private developers do drives up the costs to the citizens.

Ed stated as for the impact fees or voluntary fees, most developers are not against fees, what they are against is cost that is not spread out fairly for all of them. He stated he is just asking for a 'fair and just way' to pay the fees. He also stated they need to know those fees up front.

Commissioner Rokosch replied they are working on those options and there is a process through countywide zoning in place for those changes. He stated they do not anticipate having all the design standards completed but they will have density, height requirements, and setbacks.

Ed stated Missoula County growth is headed for Ravalli County. And the Commissioners cannot stop it. He stated it is important for the right developers to do the right kinds of development. There are a lot of 20 acre parcels that could be split into 5 acre parcels which result in minor subdivisions with less control over the conditions of approval. Commissioner Rokosch replied the Board is aware of that possibility and they are watching this issue closely in regard to density.

Paul Wilson asked how David would classify the condition of Eight Mile. He then asked the Commissioners if the current condition is not up to handling traffic now, why not issue an RSID? Commissioner Grandstaff stated the RSID was floated. Paul replied he was the one who floated it. They also worked on the bike path, hiking path and walking path. Paul stated as a private citizen, he can't make the decision to raise taxes to improve the road.

Commissioner Driscoll stated one thing that is a bad mix, is the new people that have not come forward as a group to work these things out. She stated it is important not to disregard any of the citizens in the northern section of the county.

Commissioner Grandstaff asked if the landowners have a willingness to work with Planning. Paul replied yes. David replied Eight Mile Creek Road is a major collector of traffic and with the development proposed, it is impossible to predict the amount of traffic in order to make the needed improvements.

Commissioner Rokosch stated the RSID Paul is envisioning has to be a mix of the existing citizens and the new citizens. He stated one does not have to be a private citizen to market the concept of infrastructure.

Alex stated people have a legal right to have a public hearing on the proposed subdivisions prior to countywide zoning. You can't force an RSID on someone. For the existing citizens, they could feel they are paying for development.

Paul stated he has drawn a proposed district. In the existing infrastructure, Eight Mile Creek Road is a collector down to Woodchuck Road. He doesn't believe the citizens would feel they are paying for development. By raising taxes, they get a road built to county standards. If they will not consider an RSID, he asked what they should do. Paul suggested having an arrangement with landowners. Subdivisions with fewer than 20 lots could pay pro rata and over 20 lots could construct road improvements. He felt that would be a 'hard pill to swallow' for some developers. There was some discussion of the monies utilized now being deposited into the grader district.

Dave stated the issue of recovery contracts was discussed yesterday. Alex stated without a late comer's agreement, they would not have any way to legally collect pro rata from the second person. Commissioner Driscoll stated the Board has six criteria that are considered when rendering a decision for a subdivision, not just the road. Alex discussed the possibility of new subdivision regulations and how that would affect developers already into the process. Commissioner Rokosch discussed the six criteria and voluntary contributions of the local services criterion.

Barbara Goral stated her concern is property values that are going down nation wide yet her property taxes are increasing. She suggested the Commissioners look at property value as one of the criterion. Alex interjected the Board is not allowed to consider value.

Commissioner Driscoll replied the problem with the system now is the law has to be changed in order for the Board to consider it.

Kirby Christian stated he thinks uncertainty and delay is more costly to the developer. Developers do not want to fight with neighbors. They want certainty of what you can or can't do with property. He discussed traffic studies that do not include past traffic studies from existing subdivisions. He expressed his desire to have his concerns addressed.

Attorney Bill Van Canagan stated one of the issues is there are some applications that are going to be considered in the near future. The timeline for these subdivisions do not coincide with the timeline of the zoning. He stated he is trying to seek a solution to this dilemma. One issue is the county cannot legally require one developer to bear the entire cost of road improvements without considering any consequences. He stated they are here today to help find a solution without litigation.

Dave replied the question is if they are reasonable. He felt community based effort is competing with county wide zoning but in his opinion he feels it can complement the zoning and be a countywide model. He would suggest offering protection of natural resources and wildlife habitats. For an RSID to work, the citizens need to understand the concept.

Commissioner Rokosch stated a Rural Improvement District could be a part 1 or part 2 zoning development.

Paul stated he has done RSIDs in the past and they have worked well. He explained in detail how they worked. Commissioner Rokosch asked if the district included road infrastructure. Paul replied yes. He discussed how the Commissioners could come to terms with this particular road.

Alex stated there are a number of proposals that are greater than 20 lots. He used Arrow Hills as an example. He felt the county needs some alternative solutions to the larger size subdivisions other than litigation and it will not be the last time that RSID's are brought up.

Commissioner Driscoll stated it is important to do this right. Alex stated RSID'S are a viable option in the big picture; but it is important to see what it will look like and who will be involved. He advised the Commissioners they need to focus on the specific location of the Eight Mile Creek Road.

Commissioner Rokosch stated RSID's should include existing landowners along with new landowners. He felt this RSID could work but existing land owners must agree with the boundaries. As for the late comer's agreement there is some potential recovery but that road is not the only impact. He felt there are certain risks. Alex replied people are not sure of the rules and therefore the Board needs to clarify these rules prior to any public hearing. This will allow mitigation to be presented. Commissioner Rokosch stated the rules have not changed. Alex interjected the interpretation of the rules have.

Commissioner Driscoll stated it is important to be 'far thinking' in regard to development.

Ed stated he was involved in a large 500 unit subdivision which included the use of an RSID. The developer paid approximately 60% of those costs. Ed stated Ravalli County is getting 'nickel and dimes to death' on the smaller subdivisions. None of the recently approved subdivisions have the money to improve Eight Mile Creek Road. He discussed the ability to pay down on the RSID's.

Kirby added Ravalli County has collected a lot of money for the pro rata shares. He felt it is important to look at the nexus of development in regard to pro rata. Paul stated one possibility is to have the new subdivisions enter into a special improvement district upon approval.

Further discussion took place about the boundaries of the RSID and the landowners that would be within those boundaries.

Commissioner Rokosch stated the County could do what has been mentioned here today. In regard to a voluntary zoning district, he felt it was important to have the proper balance.

Attorney Bill Van Canagan replied there are timelines that are competing with each other. The issue before the Commissioners today is Eight Mile Creek Road, and the question is what we do with it. He asked if they could work with an expedited timeline.

Commissioner Driscoll stated today's conversation has been fruitful for her as it has laid a baseline for cooperative work. Alex stated this has to be a 'one shot deal'.

Commissioner Rokosch stated whether this is a RSID or a zoning district; it needs to be in agreement. Alex stated in that sense, they are going to need to involve a few people and solve this problem.

Paul asked the Board if they would consider a voluntary zoning district for this area. Commissioner Grandstaff replied yes. Further discussion followed.

Commissioner Rokosch asked Karen for her comment. Karen replied she has outlined the key issues, and she would be willing to work with Alex on the voluntary zoning district.

► The Board met for a public hearing to consider adoption of Resolution No. 2193 which would extend the interim zoning regulation (which is also known as Resolution No. 2038). Present were Civil Counsel Alex Beal, Planning Director Karen Hughes, Planner John Lavey, Planner Randy Fifrick and several citizens.

Commissioner Rokosch opened the public hearing and asked for Alex's comments.

Alex stated there is interest in extending the '1 per 2' initiative. Today's public hearing is whether to extend Resolution No. 2038. Commissioner Thompson asked if they would make that decision today. Alex indicated if the Commissioners could make that determination today after public comment it would fit the time line for the extension.

Commissioner Rokosch stated Resolution No. 2038 was adopted by vote last November. He stated what is in front of the Board today has no changes from the adopted Resolution; it is simply an extension. Commissioner Rokosch then gave an overview of the countywide zoning project.

Commissioner Thompson stated it is important to follow the intent of the voters. He stated he understands from legal counsel the Board can change the zoning from its current context.

Commissioner Driscoll stated after hearing citizens input, she will vote to extend the resolution. She will not go against the will of the people.

Commissioner Grandstaff stated the '1 per 2' zoning is a clumsy tool for the county to work with. She gave an example of a subdivision, that when drawn looks good, but when it was re-drawn to comply with the '1 per 2' zoning it looked terrible. She stated the Board does have the ability to amend the resolution to include density.

Alex replied due to the interaction with the initiative statute, this is in effect until December. After that time, the Board can appeal or amend to their heart's content. The Board could extend with modifications. If there are significant changes, the Board would need to have a second meeting. However, if the Board agrees to extend the interim zoning, his suggestion is to keep it as it is. He stated there is the ability of the voters to challenge the actions of the Board. However it is unclear if it is challengeable if it is extended as it is currently written.

Commissioner Grandstaff stated '1 per 2' zoning is not tied to streamside setbacks.

Commissioner Rokosch opened the floor for public comment.

Jimmy Canton stated he is a third generation landowner and core committee member. He has asked people what they want. They have replied they do not support the extension of Resolution No. 2038. A lot of people requested he speak since they could not make the meeting. The '1 per 2' takes away the 'American Dream' of people that work for minimum wage. These people can't afford one acre, and those that can want some privacy. Less than 25% of the people voted in the general election. The Sons of the Bitterroot are ashamed they did not 'pound the pavement' regarding the initiative. One person that called stated they purchased 5 acres without covenants or restrictions so their children could have some land when they grow up. They can't afford now to go out and buy another 5 acres. None of these people that voted '1 per 2' brought up the house bills. It does include streamside setbacks and water rights. He stated many of the created lots have water at 15 minutes per gallon. He does not respect any public official that says they

are following the people when only 25% voted. The '1 per 2' is nothing but urban sprawl. He felt they should have a proper vote on this issue. He felt it is a pathetic crisis tool for mismanagement by the government. He stated he and others request the Board exercise their legal ability and allow another vote on this matter. He asked the citizens who agree with him to stand up. A majority of the people in the room stood up. Jimmy then stated 'let the people be heard'.

Jenny Stoddard asked Commissioner Thompson if they were to have a density mandate how comprehensive zoning would affect open space. Commissioner Rokosch stated Commissioner Thompson cannot answer the question at this time.

Commissioner Driscoll asked Jenny how she felt the '1 per 2' affected the construction industry. Jenny replied Governor Schweitzer issued a comment stating "what's driving Montana's economy is new people coming here, building, and starting businesses with just a few employees. It's really the construction boom that's been the biggest driver".

Stewart Brandborg stated he represents the Bitterrooters for Planning. He stated the broad public wants to see the beauty and open space. This Board denied Aspen Springs based on that interest. '1 per 2' does not divide the county into two acre lots. Rather, the initiative was to hold up the development. The citizens are the ultimate judge of the process and we won't be happy until big developments are not allowed to come in. Previous to the '1 for 2' the big developer can come into Ravalli County. Stewart stated he has spent 12 years fighting with the Planning Department and the Board of Commissioners. These years are wasted time and energy in regard to discussions of what to do without a resolution. He asked what we can do to relieve the public of this burden. The answer is we will be a model for the Montana region. He requested the Board follow the mandate that was voted on.

Krista Kanenwisher stated she does not see developers but rather builders and individuals who want the liberty to have control over their own growth and development. Her concern is what she heard today is the Board understands Resolution No. 2038 is poorly written, and agrees the public is confused. She is an English Teacher and wonders if the intent by the authors was to write it poorly as to cause confusion. She has heard each of them say they are standing here because of the voice of the people. People on her street stated Resolution No. 2038 would not pass. She knew it would and when it did, people were dumbfounded. She is here to speak as a voice for the people. She used an example of a small town in Washington with a population of 834 people who like most people are concerned about keeping their town nice.

Ron Kramis stated his grandfather homesteaded Lost Horse and he hoped to retire here. He stated people are commenting about the terrible things that are happening to Hamilton and the Bitterroot Valley. He has stopped driving down Highway 93 during the day because he can't stomach it. Lack of planning destroys private property rights. The problem is planning did not happen 30 years ago and everyone is suffering for it. The only way to protect property rights and economic investment is to get things done on paper so people will know what they can or can't do. Private property rights can be

destroyed by 'neighborly' individuals. Those kinds of individuals say they have property rights then do what they want with their property with no regard to their neighbors. The best way to avoid the loss of value and rights is to 'get your property done'. He has been run off by the Sheriff for trying to distribute information stating how planning can be beneficial. He stated Planning is necessary for both property rights and economic value.

Tom Robak stated he hopes to be the sound of reason in this conversation. They are hearing two extremes. He commented on Stewart Brandborg's statement to Commissioner Driscoll to stop growth for one year and then another year. Most people who live here are in the construction field. Look at Darby, they are dying on the vine. What happens when we go to a no-growth for one or two years? Most people are opening their tax bills and finding it has doubled or in some instances tripled. Most citizens only earn \$25,000 to \$30,000 per year. And those jobs pay the taxes. Eventually these people won't be able to afford to live here and they will have to move. Rich Californians will move in and property values will skyrocket and your friends have already moved. There are not a lot of people 'pounding' to get in here.

Nancy Kramis stated they love their property in Corvallis. She doesn't hear most people advocating 'no growth'; rather they are emphasizing 'planning for growth'. If the county does not plan for growth, the area becomes unattractive. One example is Portland, Oregon. After 1980, it was a nice place and it upped the amount of tourism, then growth. Her suggestion is to look at other beautiful areas that are no longer beautiful due to the lack of planning and growth and go from there.

Linda Turner stated she is an average voter. When she voted, she understood it was for one house per two acres, and it was not a density issue. Most people find it attractive to move in to a new home versus an older home. She would like to see the law they voted for upheld.

Brian Glenn stated he has a lot of commitment to the zoning process. He does not believe in two acre parcels for families starting out. The average wage for the younger generation is \$25,000 per year and 'affordable housing' starts at around \$230,000. He asked how kids are going to buy a house. People have to work out of state in order to afford to live in the Bitterroot. What about the people who don't want to work out of state to live here?

Bill Zader stated he believed when he voted it was for density. The people who lived here pretty much worked with their hands thirty years ago. Now people are retired. He felt their vote should count.

Jani Summers stated she is representing the Farm Bureau. She requested the Board to look at the density issue. She presented the Board with an article from the newspaper. People are hungry now for work so affordable housing is important in the valley.

Dave Schultz stated he is in favor of extending and changing Resolution No. 2038. He stated he is in favor of housing developments in regard to density along with affordable housing that makes sense. He stated the growth policy is what 'this whole issue is all



about'. He felt they need another year and also noted the Planning Department has done a fantastic job. The farmers and the ranchers need zoning but need to have the ability to pull money from their property. He supports extending the resolution.

Ben Hillicoss stated he supports planning. He has lived here for 13 years. He bought his first house 47 years ago. One of the comments he hears is if you build or make improvements, your taxes will go up. He also hears if the Commissioners extend this for another year it will stop development. But he knows it will not stop development. Currently there is a huge amount of homes on the market and there is a huge meltdown on the mortgage market. He felt the Commissioners should extend the '1 per 2' resolution today which will give the CPC and the Consultants time to finish their work. He thinks the Board should support the CPC groups with Phase 1.

Curtis Cook stated he is an attorney. He was born in 1916 and has seen many changes over his life time. He hopes the changes that are going to be made will help the valley, not destroy it. '1 per 2' is an interim zoning method which was put into place to slow down and stop development until zoning and planning measures can be put in place. Without '1 per 2', there would be thousands of new lots in the time it takes to do the zoning. He gave examples of the problems with ground water, the aquifers, the streams and sewer/septic. He used Atlanta as an example for water shortages. He also noted the valley has had a drought situation in this county for quite awhile, and it is important to be careful not to run into that situation down the line. A lot of places have a '1 per 40' acre restrictions during the zoning process. The '1 per 2' only goes during the time it takes to put zoning in place; it could be 1 per 10 or 1 per 40. He stated when some people stand up and tell you they are so upset with the '1 per 2' creating sprawl, they don't know what they are talking about. It could end up being 1 per anything. As for the person concerned with dividing up 4 acres amongst his children, he suggests they speak to a lawyer because he can still do that. The people who want a new election because they don't understand the language are the same people who are up here complaining about the '1 per 2'. They voted on it. He stated he voted for the '1 per 2' because he knew it meant one house on two acres, just as it was listed on the ballot. If people want to participate they should participate in the CPC meetings.

Chip Pigman stated '1 per 2' was promoted as a growth tool. As a member of the Planning Board, they looked at Planning's budget and it was reduced due to the reduction in growth, so to him this worked. He challenges the Board to improve their use of the tools, particularly when it comes to the voters mandate for open space.

Travis Martinez stated he understands zoning is temporary but the job loss is permanent.

Mark Heller stated he moved here to live in a little town. All summer long, more water was dumped into the Bitterroot. People who are talking about stopping growth need to realize growth won't stop, rather the growth needs to be controlled. He also noted people who want to subdivide and build here are going to find it very hard.

Shelley Cole stated the people who stated they do not want growth are the ones who stated they moved here from 'wherever' and now they don't want anybody else moving in. They got their piece of the pie and they do not want to share it. She explained her situation with her subdivision. She indicated young people can not afford any housing in the valley and working families within this valley cannot wait another year. She is in favor of extending Resolution No. 2038.

Pam Spillan stated she does not think '1 per 2' is an answer to the growth problem. There are better ways to develop and grow. She asked if people are going to need three incomes for each family in order to make it in the valley. She doesn't think we should kill growth.

Nicole Jones stated '1 per 2' was not an honest election. The desire of the people is for a plan that will deal with smart progress. She said one cannot talk about affordable housing with the '1 per 2' in effect.

Carl Fox stated he believes he is hearing that most people are committed to continuing some kind of interim zoning. He is in agreement with Commissioner Thompson. Hopefully those issues could be clarified so those problems don't continue. He stated he can sympathize with people who are having a hard time making ends meet.

Rod Hudson stated he is a local rancher and the State Director of Montana's Ranchers Association. He leases most of his ground because he can't afford it. He has a small parcel in Corvallis. He is opposed to the '1 per 2'.

Ken Madden requested clarification of the extension period. Alex replied the extension period is one year and the Board can make changes. He asked if they could vote to amend the opinion by County Attorney George Corn. Alex replied yes.

Jan Weisnewski stated it is a true shame what is happening here. During the summer, we are heating the valley. New Mexico is recycling their wastewater. There is a system called SBR cleaner pumped from the aquifer. A lot of the people will not go for the '1 per 2' because of the cost. Jan spoke of water rights and wells going dry. Commissioner Thompson interjected that Jan is speaking of a certain subdivision.

Krista asked if the Commissioners have changed their minds particularly after they have received this public comment. Commissioner Driscoll stated she has been known to change her mind after receiving public comment. Commissioner Rokosch stated he takes public comment and public input seriously. He applauds the audience in taking the time to be here and participate.

Commissioner Grandstaff stated the testimony has had effect on her decision. Alex added his intentions were not to state their vote but to have a starting point. He would not recommend voting without public comment since the public elected the Board.

Discussion followed regarding irrigation and water rights.

Timothy Mitchell stated the Commissioners all agreed to vote on this issue and are now stating they have changed their minds. He stated Alex commented earlier the '1 for 2' will expire November 7<sup>th</sup>. Alex clarified it can expire November 7<sup>th</sup> if it is not extended by a vote of the Commissioners (meaning extending Resolution No. 2038).

Commissioner Rokosch stated this issue is what they are discussing right now. He stated people should be involved in the CPC meetings in the valley. Commissioner Driscoll stated they are gathering groups in seven different districts which will include a satellite group. She stated the issue is to have people take a common sense approach to zoning. The Commissioners hope to have this completed by November 7<sup>th</sup> of 2008. Timothy asked if part of the interim zoning is part of the Streamside Setbacks. Commissioner Rokosch replied no.

Mike Harbine stated he believes '1 per 2' is not an honest issue to use for growth during the one year period. He advised the Commissioners not to use that as a representation of how the citizens feel because most did not vote on it.

Russ Hunt stated the Commissioners need to take into consideration that this is not just one year, but two years. There are still subdivisions coming in which still meet the subdivision regulation process.

Ken (unknown last name) asked if the planning process is working. He requested they vote against the '1 per 2'.

Curtis Cook stated he would like to make a couple of clarifications. He does not know how Alex can say the Board can change the '1 per 2' Resolution. If they voted against the '1 per 2', it would end. The interim zoning prevents developers from bringing whatever they want to the Planning Board. The reason for extending the interim zoning period is to prevent closing the door on the people and the developers coming with whatever they want. Alex replied the Commissioners can't change what the voters requested during the one year time but the statutes allow an extension and changes to the interim zoning by the Commissioners for the extra one year period. There was further discussion and a difference of opinion between Curtis and Alex in regard to the zoning statutes.

Stewart Brandborg stated the Board can only extend for one year.

Jeri Drake stated she has lived here for 24 years. When she came here today she was for the '1 per 2' and now has changed her mind. Growth is happening at a runaway rate, and if the Commissioners can assure her that one more year will put zoning into place she would be in favor of it.

Commissioner Rokosch requested any other public comment, hearing none. He then requested a 10 minute recess.

Commissioner Rokosch reconvened the meeting. He stated he has seen quite a diversity of opinions today. The question is where they are in the zoning process. Currently they

are conducting the CPC meetings and continue to seek additional valley residents to participate. Much of what he has heard today needs to be brought to those meetings. The issue today is whether or not to extend Resolution No. 2038. He felt the intent is not to stop growth and zoning will not stop growth. He stated the newly elected Commissioners have been in office for roughly 16 weeks and in that time, they have reviewed 16 subdivisions. They have denied two and are being challenged on those two. He suggested they think about the housing issue. He asked what is at the heart of it. And stated they need to think of it as a whole. The main thing for him to consider is that the interim measure approved by the voters, has the intent and purpose expressing the emergency situation with growth. He stated the Commissioners have before them an opportunity to use zoning as one tool. For example, they could use a hammer to either build or tear down. Some of the reasons we live here are the basis of economic growth. He felt they have come a long way in the context of the '1 per 2' passed by the voters. He feels at this point by not staying the course, they would interrupt the progress already made.

Commissioner Thompson stated comments have been made about letting the people revote on the issue. He is a firm believer in elections. Whether 20% of the people show up or all of the people, it doesn't matter. The greatest president the country ever had was elected on a 40% vote – Abraham Lincoln. In response to the gentlemen who spoke about his taxes doubling, that can not occur because with I-105, the Commissioners cannot raise taxes. Taxes are raised with improvements to your home. In regard to losing jobs, Montana hangs in the middle. Montana does not hit the highs or the lows of the national averages. His concern is voter turn out. If the Commissioners don't do anything with the '1 for 2' it opens the door to the Planning Department. This extension gives planning a chance to review what does come through the door. He has said it will take longer than a year. He would like to see changes in regard to saving agricultural land and open space.

Commissioner Driscoll stated she attended a conference last week and the biggest thing she learned from that conference is the pain people are in over this concept. She stated 'we are going to be in for a rough time over the next few years'. She also noted there are many buildable lots right now and if zoning gets done sooner than next year's date, the '1 per 2' goes out the window.

Commissioner Grandstaff stated she is in agreement with the Board. If the Commissioners oppose the extension, it will have an impact. She stated the testimony heard today has made an impact on her. She felt if the '1 per 2' is in place for another year, they should address the density issue. And as for the comment that the Board makes a rash decision, that is not true because if you have sat through a six hour subdivision meeting, you would know the Commissioners do not make rash decisions.

Commissioner Thompson stated as for the people standing up and showing their will, he believes it will truly show in the polls.

**Commissioner Driscoll made a motion to adopt Resolution No. 2193 which extends the interim zoning regulation known as Resolution No. 2038 for a period of one additional year. Commissioner Grandstaff seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Thompson asked Alex if they can make the necessary changes with amendments. Alex replied they could and noted the Commissioners should hold some public meetings in that regard. Board discussion followed regarding legality of those changes.

Commissioner Rokosch called for any further comments, hearing none.

**All voted 'aye'.**